

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the above amendment, the claims will be 1 to 4, 5 and 8 to 18.

The above amendment is responsive to points set forth in the Official Action.

With regard to the objection to the term "plurality" of spacer layers, it is assumed that this objection also refers to the term "plurality" of electrodes appearing in the claims.

Accordingly, the term "plurality" has been deleted from the claims and on pages 6 to 8 of the specification.

The term "plurality" merely means a state of it being plural. Therefore, the term "plurality" of spacer layers adds nothing to the term "spacer layers".

In view of the above amendment, it is considered that the objections to the specification and claims have been overcome.

In Official Action paragraphs 5 to 9, claims 2, 12 and 14 to 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Iwasaki (U.S. 2003/0087179 A1).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

(i) To those unskilled in the art, it may appear that the laminate described in claim 2 is a partial laminate of the multiple layer laminate disclosed in Iwasaki.

(ii) However, it is neither practical nor realistic to form a two layer laminate consisting of a photosensitive unbaked spacer material layer (34) and an intermediate layer (35), considering that the purpose of the intermediate layer (35) in Iwasaki is to improve adhesion with an alkali-soluble thermoplastic layer (36).

(iii) Further, a partial laminate derived from Iwasaki would only be realistic if it included the alkali-soluble thermoplastic layer (36) in addition to the photosensitive unbaked spacer material layer (34) and the intermediate layer (35).

(iv) Accordingly, the laminate of above- amended claim 2, which does not include the alkali-soluble thermoplastic layer (36) due to its "consisting" format, is neither anticipated by nor obvious from Iwasaki.

Similar comments apply to claims 12, 14 and 15 which depend on claim 2.

In Official Action paragraphs 11 to 18, claims 1, 4 and 6 to 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Kosaka et al. (U.S. 6,207,268 B2; hereinafter '268) in view of Iwasaki.

This rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of the rejected claims.

In Official Action paragraphs 19 to 22, claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwasaki in view of Oshio et al. (U.S. 2002/0163108).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, claim 2 is neither disclosed nor suggested by Iwasaki.

Claim 5 depends on claim 2 and it is also clear that Oshio et al. does not overcome the above-discussed deficiencies of Iwasaki.

In Official Action paragraphs 23 to 27, claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kosaka et al. (U.S. 6,039,622; hereinafter '622) in view of Saegusa et al. (U.S. 6,825,140).

This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Kosaka et al. neither discloses nor suggests the laminate of claim 8 since layer 54 in Fig. 5C is a mask pattern which is to be peeled off before sintering (see Example 1 (4)).

Further, Kosaka et al. fail to disclose or suggest the problem of residual spacer material, which is solved by the present invention, since Kosaka et al. employ a sandblast method to remove a portion of the barrier rib material layer 51 and the bind film 52.

Accordingly, Kosaka et al. fail to disclose or suggest employing the intermediate layer to solve the problem of residual spacer material.

Therefore, claim 8 is not obvious over Kosaka et al. in view of Saegusa et al. (U.S. 6,825,140).

In Official Action paragraphs 28 to 39, claims 3 and 9 to 11 (and apparently claims 13 and 17) have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '622 (Kosaka et al.) in view of Saegusa et al. and further in view of Oshio et al.

The above-discussed deficiencies of Kosaka et al. are also applicable to this rejection. It is clear that Saegusa et al. and Oshio et al. do not overcome the above-discussed deficiencies of Kosaka et al.

In Official Action paragraphs 40 to 43, claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '622 in view of Saegusa et al. in view of Oshio et al., and further in view of Obiya et al. (U.S. 5,919,569).

There is nothing in Obiya et al. which overcomes the above-discussed deficiencies of '622, Saegusa et al. and Oshio et al.

In Official Action paragraphs 44 to 46, claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '622 in view of Saegusa et al. in view of Oshio et al., and further in view of Iwasaki.

This rejection is also respectfully traversed.


It is also clear that there is nothing in Iwasaki which overcomes the above-discussed deficiencies of '622 in view of Saegusa et al. and Oshio et al.

No further issues remaining, allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or proposals for expediting prosecution, please contact undersigned at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Hitoshi SETSUDA et al.

By: 
Matthew M. Jacob
Registration No. 25,154
Attorney for Applicants

MJ/aas
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 24, 2008